



**Department of Health and Social Services  
Division of Developmental Disabilities Services (DDDS)  
Quality Working Group**

**February 6, 2015 - Meeting Minutes**

**Meeting Location:** DDDS Fox Run Site – Large Training Room, Bear, Delaware

**Time:** 2 p.m. – 4 p.m.

**Facilitator:** Kimberly Reinagel-Nietubicz, Controller General's Office

**Minutes:** Vicky Gordy, DDDS

**DDDS Quality Working Group Members Present**

Pat Maichle, DDC	Kimberly Reinagel-Nietubicz, Controller General's Office
Rebecca Reichardt, OMB	Carol Kenton, Parent
Steve Tull, Parent	Stevie Tull, Self Advocate
Gail Womble, Parent	Tessie Bonk, Parent
Laurie Nicoli, Parent	Micki Edelson, Parent
Debra Miller, Chimes	C. Thomas Cook, Delarf
Kim Siegel, Lt. Governor's Office*	Terry Olson, The ARC of DE
Frann Anderson, DDDS	Jane Gallivan, DDDS

**AGENDA:**

- I. Welcome and Introductions
- II. Review and Approval of Meeting Minutes
- III. Review of Mission Statement
- IV. Content/Timeline of Report to Legislature
- V. Next Meeting Topics and Date

**I. Welcome Introductions**

Meeting opened with Kimberly Reinagel-Nietubicz thanking everyone for participating and attending; introductions made.

**II. Review and Approval of Meeting Minutes**

The Working Group reviewed and approved minutes of December 18, 2014, except for the following revisions:

- Kim Siegel attending as an "observer" (not a Working Group Member)
- Second paragraph of agenda item V, replace "with Vanguard" to "at Dunganvin".

Revisions made and sent to Working Group on February 9, 2015.

DDDS has begun to investigate how other states address rating provider agencies via “report cards”. DDDS shared an Annual Quality Assurance Survey Report that Oklahoma utilizes. Oklahoma reportedly has a rate setting tool that is used for outcome based payments for employment. DDDS is unaware if outcome based payments are utilized in residential settings in Oklahoma. This survey report also falls in same areas and may serve purpose of monitoring proficiency level compliance surrounding the DDDS CMS Community Rule Transition Plan. DDDS will continue to seek information from Oklahoma.

DDDS has a conference call scheduled on February 13<sup>th</sup> with Dr. Buscemi of South Carolina to discuss the process South Carolina used to develop a public reporting system for provider data including quality assurance reviews. Due to South Carolina not allowing any state government growth, all QA services are contractor provided.

### **III. Review of Mission Statement**

This agenda item is to review the mission statement to provide a set of contexts for the report to the Legislature. The Working Group agreed on the following mission statement:

*The mission of the DDDS Quality Standards Working Group is to establish meaningful, objective and measurable provider quality performance standards which promote focus on each individual served, their lifestyle choices, their rights, their growth, and their pursuit of happiness; which provide each individual and their involved guardian/family with the comparative performance data needed to effectively assist them in making informed choices in selecting providers; and upon which provider funding and performance reimbursement incentives may be based.*

### **IV. Content/Timeline of Report to Legislature**

As suggested by Representative Smith, the Working Group will include in report to Legislature what the Working Group has reviewed and the direction of Working Group. Topics important to convey in the report are data DDDS currently holds, what is needed, and how to proceed to transform system. The Working Group does not have a full-blown recommendation but the mission statement talks about having quality performance standards to help people make informed choices. Two key areas that we want to move forward with in report are the need to develop quality performance standards and how the outcomes will be made available for consumers to make an informed choice.

C. Thomas Cook provided the Working Group with a memorandum that outlined DELARF’s proposal for the report. Discussion was had regarding requesting resources for a facilitator to advise the Working Group of best practice models for a minimum set of quality performance standards that are sensitive to changes in provider funding that outcomes would be most useful to assist public in making informed choice.

The Working Group discussed that rate studies are typically valid for a three-year period, and may need to be refreshed or require periodic reviews to stay current. In the Governor’s recommended budget, the amount is annualized, with the increase that began January 1<sup>st</sup>. The DDDS Rate Study was completed by Roger Deshaies, who may be contacted to explain the process he followed to complete the study. The DDDS Rate Study attempted to identify the variables used to include current cost of business.

Resources gained during past transition of individuals from institutional services to residential services were discussed by Working Group (resource was used to support individuals transitioning from

institutional services and to support other individuals in residing in same residential setting via DMMA).

There is the assumption that if provider agencies are paid at a fully funded rate a higher quality standard is expected due to costs being met, as opposed to agencies not able to provide more supervision, training, etc. due to not being fully funded which may impact quality. A mechanism must be in place to continue to assess that quality is improving and that results are relayed to consumers to make an informed choice. Discussion included that in some instances the quality outcome of service is based on the values and commitment of agency as evidenced by differences in quality of agencies receiving the same rates. All agreed that focus is necessary to identify expected outcomes. Once expected outcomes are established, quality standards (for measurement) may be developed.

DDDS is working to organize the considerable amount of data currently collected. DDDS is moving ahead and Frann Anderson will bring a sample of a very early draft of what the residential standards are beginning to look like that reportedly are very person centered. DDDS struggles with some programs that do not have an internal quality improvement process and continue to rely on DDDS reviews for quality improvement. This presents DDDS with the task of developing standards to require provider agencies to have an internal quality improvement program as provider agencies must have their own internal quality improvement to improve outcomes. The DDDS bi-annual report that is required by contract was due January 31<sup>st</sup>. This report template was updated to identify outcomes by submitting not only numbers but also what the process is to assure numbers decline by next reporting date and if process is not working how often process reviews will occur to change for desired outcome. This change was implemented so provider agencies will know without DDDS contact that process is or is not working.

Outcomes based on requirements should be contractual; therefore, if not abiding have chance to correctively act. If no action is taken after three months, contract close out should begin. This does not appear to happen as often as should, statewide.

DDDS has established probation protocol that is very quality based. DDDS provides desired outcome and provider agency must report how they plan to meet outcome, and report plan status to DDDS monthly. If plan is not meeting desired outcome, provider agency is to report changes in plan to meet outcome to DDDS. This protocol is performance based and has an explicit outline.

The Working Group discussed how many provider agencies office headquarters are located out of state and have their own training curriculum. Frann Anderson distributed a packet of information to include a grid from Elsevier who executes College of Direct Support trainings that compares regulatory requirements for HCBS with available trainings.

A Direct Support Professional Certification program overview (from Duluth), curriculum, and sample of certificate of completion were included in packet. This particular program is for people with minimum experience or who are unfamiliar with field. After participants complete the four part training program they are guaranteed a job interview with a participating agency. Different provider agencies sponsor training program as a recruitment mechanism for DSP's. This has typically been a collaborative effort of mid-size provider agencies to offer DSP's a realistic job review free of cost to trainee. This also helps trainee to determine if this type of employment is a good fit before actually working in the field (which promotes lower turnover rates and cost efficiencies). The Working Group discussed offering a DSP course via community college. Homes for Life is one of the sponsors of scholarship funding at DelTech who offers a DSP certification program. The Working Group discussed that many cannot afford the

funds or time to attend courses and many course participants are seeking an associate degree that do not plan to work as a DSP. DDDS encourages as many DSP's courses or certification classes as possible.

Due to past Working Group discussion, regarding if competency-based training would have an impact on staff turnover the packet also included the Impact Newsletter: Feature Issue on the Importance of Competency-Based Training for DSP's from the University of Minnesota. C. Thomas Cook spoke about his past work with Dungarvan that piloted a competency based training and evaluation program in Minnesota that was not adopted as it was too time consuming. Mr. Cook warned Working Group of layering on more standards or processes as competency-based training must be assessed to reveal if used and this requires another development process. Mr. Cook also revealed that a human service assistant curriculum was discontinued at Madison Technical College due to the department of workforce development in Wisconsin feeling that the jobs do not pay enough to justify spending money on curriculum.

The standards and outcomes must show how to determine that all DSP's are well trained, paid well, and do an exception job, if the system is going to be change through this process. This report must make these recommendations as many DSP's have multiple employments due to low wage which directly effects performance.

Most data that DDDS collects is self-reported as well as data from families. If DDDS survey components were weighted, critical standards could be determined. The example of the Oklahoma Annual QA Survey Report obviously includes weighing and scoring in certain pieces.

A member of the Working Group suggested that DDDS results from provider agency "audits" be used as rating mechanism. DDDS explained the survey process to include that agency standards are reviewed (accessibility, water temperature, medications passed appropriately). A quality service review occurs where an individual is chosen for the surveyor to review ELP, all documentation, all supports provided, and has a discussion with individual to verify if they understand ELP, if supports are being met, and if satisfied. Surveyors will report on anything that does not appear correct (i.e. someone considered a fall risk that must use steps that are unsafe). The information is compiled in a survey report that is sent to provider agency to report plan of correction. If same citations are observed yearly, DDDS requires agencies to submit reports to include how the intended outcome will occur. If agency provider is not cooperative, DDDS begins to discuss probation, which is intended to help guide the provider for positive outcomes. Currently, the public does not have access to reports. DDDS is in the process of revising survey format to including two surveyors (versus one) and two reports, one of which may be posted with a link to other report (without any identifying individual information) for public access. Part of DDDS internal OQI will include that surveyors do not survey same sites year after year and internal in-house measures to be sure that survey standards are same statewide.

The Working Group is looking at long-term and getting started on making significant changes for five years from now to include increasing funding to put ideas in place to make a significant change in people's lives.

The Working Group discussed updating the DDDS website by adding a place for consumers to post their reviews in the same manner that other industries consumers/customers rate services (i.e. hotel.com). This would not be the sole measure but would be useful and empower the consumer. All agreed that this is a wonderful idea for interactive ability although difficulties typically arise within the Department of Technical & Information to host these types of systems.

Comparison performance data that is useful from the consumer perspective should be a big part of the focus of the Working Group. How this will be weighted/measured needs to be addressed also. Provider agency ratings must use a statistically solid sample; therefore, more than one survey result must be used to rate. The data set for this process is looking at data, creating a report card for families, looking at data for outcome so that then we can look at quality outcomes for providers. This process will require adjustments as occurrences present.

DDDS is in the process of revising website. DDDS is locked into the current webpage format but is working to revise for a more “user friendly” website. Certain DDDS staff received permission to begin to use Facebook to create a DDDS Facebook page, but more time is necessary to complete. The Government Information Center was very helpful in the development of the Developmental Disabilities Council website.

The Working Group decided that the following is to be included in the report to Legislature:

- Mission Statement
- Description of Working Group Meetings (reviewed data and various topics discussed by Working Group)
- Guiding Principles
  - ❖ Transparent Process
  - ❖ Standards to Enhance Pay of Direct Support Professionals and Supervisors
  - ❖ Consumer Rating Abilities (for transparency)
  - ❖ Enhance Quality without Detracting from Quality Direct Services & Supports
  - ❖ Strengthen Collaboration
  - ❖ Expand & Enhance Data Based Empirical Knowledge
- Recommendations
  - ❖ Hire Facilitator
  - ❖ Enhance Training Curriculum
  - ❖ Staff to Create & Maintain Agency Ratings
  - ❖ Staff to Research & Create Data Reports
  - ❖ Staff to Create Web Format & Maintain
  - ❖ Staff to Research Best Practice Models of Quality Rating Practices
  - ❖ Delaware Website Accessible for Data Integration (this may be a low priority to DTI)

## **V. Next Meeting Topics and Date**

Please send any thoughts or additional suggestions to include in report to Legislature to Jane Gallivan. Jane Gallivan will send the draft report to Working Group to review before March meeting.

Doodle will be used for scheduling March meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.